

Professional Standards Advisory Board Meetings
Thursday, July 29, 2010
10:00 a.m.
Minutes

The July 29, 2010 meeting of the Professional Standards Advisory Board was called to order by Jason Woebkenberg at 10:08 a.m. Members David Holt and Carrie Billman were not in attendance and Dr. Bennett had not yet arrived. Mr. Woebkenberg led the board and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. The approval of minutes of the March 10, 2010 meeting was moved by Dr. Johnstone and seconded by Mr. Jones. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Woebkenberg welcomed four new board members: Dr. Brad Oliver, Indiana Wesleyan University; Rebecca Gardenour, New Albany Community Schools local board member; Cindy Kostoff, special education teacher from Churubusco; and Dr. Greg Hinshaw, Superintendent, Randolph Central School Corporation. Mr. Woebkenberg explained that there are statutory eligibility requirements for board members and during the past year, 4 of the board members changed their roles or jobs, which in turn caused them not to meet the eligibility criteria for their appointment. Consequently, those members left the board and 4 new members were appointed.

Mr. Woebkenberg noted that Dr. Bennett was delayed and would present his comments after his arrival or at the end of the meeting.

Moving to new business, Mr. Woebkenberg noted that the first agenda item is Teaching Standards and Pat Mapes would introduce the item. Mr. Mapes explained that the next step following the adoption of the newest licensing rules, REPA, is the updating of the teaching standards for each content area. The DOE issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for development of teaching standards and the company that was awarded the contract is Evaluation Systems, a group of Pearson. Representatives from Evaluation Systems who are working on the standards project--Barbara Appel, Nancy Hahn and Steve Weiss--were present to provide information on the standards development process to board members.

Ms. Appel, Director of Test Development Services, began the presentation by providing an overview of the company and the various aspects of its work in the education sector. Evaluation Systems/Pearson is involved around the country in the area of developing standards and also developing teacher licensure tests, providing test development and administration services to 17 states. Ms. Appel gave an overview of the standards development project and explained that Indiana's teaching standards will be aligned to its K-12 academic standards.

Next, Ms. Hahn explained the standards development process. Standards are being developed for 44 instructional content areas, 2 school leader areas (building level and district level) and 5 school setting (developmental) levels. The first step is to establish guidelines to incorporate the common core standards and to ensure the standards are rigorous, significant, provide a coherent and unified vision of the knowledge and skills needed by Indiana educators. The standards should be clear, accurate, Indiana specific, observable, grounded in scientifically-based research, free of bias, reflect the diversity

of Indiana's population and aligned with state and national policy documents. The second step is for standards development specialists who are very experienced in summarizing and organizing large amounts of information to analyze program and policy materials, including the Indiana Academic Standards, and standards of national organizations, etc. The third step is drafting standards and reviewing them for content, alignment and bias. Step four is gathering feedback from reviewers from DOE, higher education and classroom teachers and the iterative process of refining the standards, and the review/approval by the Professional Standards Advisory Board. The final step is preparation of a technical report documenting the project.

Steve Weiss addressed the board concerning the design and structure of the standards. Using a draft of the government/citizenship standards to illustrate, Mr. Weiss explained that each standard will have a consistent format that includes 5 elements:

1. A list of the standards covering the content.
2. Electronic links to Indiana's academic standards.
3. An articulation of each standard into its essential elements of knowledge.
4. A selected bibliography.
5. A correlation table demonstrating alignment.

Each standard will focus on content but will also include content-specific pedagogy. Pedagogy for the developmental levels will be included in the developmental standards for the five school settings. Mr. Weiss observed that across the nation, most states' teaching standards are heavy on pedagogy. Indiana's focus on content is notable and we are the first state to develop standards aligned to the common core standards. Indiana's academic standards are highly regarded nationally. Ms. Koehler asked how teachers are involved in the process. Mr. Weiss commented that over 150 Indiana educators, including classroom teachers and higher education personnel, have been recruited to review and provide feedback in order to refine the standards.

Dr. Bennett asked how Indiana's standards will compare to those of other states. Mr. Weiss responded that most other states don't have as close an alignment of student standards and teacher standards as Indiana will have.

Dr. Van Horn asked if there is research to support the shift in the standards toward content. Mr. Weiss responded that research shows teachers with solid content knowledge perform better in the classroom, which ultimately means having students who can achieve academic expectations. Dr. Van Horn agreed, and asked why more states haven't focused on content. Mr. Weiss indicated that it is a shift of emphasis in which Indiana is leading the movement. He stated that research shows educational reform is successful when teacher licensing regulations, teacher standards, student standards, and teacher preparation programs are aligned.

Dr. Johnstone asked how we know if our teacher assessments are aligned with the standards. Mr. Mapes responded that aligning licensure tests is the next step. The DOE is preparing to issue an RFP for development of licensure exams that are aligned with the standards and that assess all content areas. Dr. Van Horn asked how quickly that can be accomplished considering that students will be completing preparation programs based on the new standards in a relatively short time. Mr. Mapes stated the testing companies that have expressed interest in our RFP are not concerned about the short time frame.

Mr. Woebkenberg closed the discussion and moved on to the next agenda item dealing with certification of Educational Interpreters (EI). Mr. Mapes began the discussion by explaining that the legislature gave the DOE responsibility to certify Educational Interpreters as of July 1, 2011, including the development of certification standards. Matt Tusing, Office of Legal Affairs, has been working with the EI Task Force and put together the background documents that were sent to the board in advance. Mr. Tusing and the OELD staff need consensus and general direction from the board as to how the standards should be drafted. Risa Regnier was introduced to present the information in Mr. Tusing's absence and to continue the discussion.

Ms. Regnier presented two recommendations made by the Educational Interpreters Task Force and suggested that of the two options, staff would recommend Option #1 with a few modifications. The goals of the Office of Educator Licensing in developing EI standards is to increase EI qualifications but not to disenfranchise those EIs already certified and not to create a shortage of EIs due to the sudden application of higher standards for certification. New standards will definitely include a "grandfather" clause for EIs already certified. The task force recommendations generally follow the REPA structure of starting with an initial certificate that includes a beginning interpreter residency, moving to a proficient practitioner certificate based on meeting additional qualifications, and ending up with a professional certificate upon achieving higher qualifications such as a degree and national certification through the Registry for Interpreters of the Deaf (RID). Mr. Mapes commented that it is not necessary for the requirements to follow the REPA structure, and the main goal is to develop standards and a certification process that works for all involved. Mr. Woebkenberg clarified that the timeline for adopting these standards calls for a final vote in January 2011. Ms. Regnier confirmed that was the case so that the review of the final rule by other agencies could be complete and the EI certification requirements could be communicated prior to July 1, 2011 when the DOE's authority to certify EIs becomes effective.

Dr. Johnstone asked what the EI certification would be called. Mr. Mapes and Ms. Regnier responded that it was up to the board whether to call it a license, a certificate, or a permit. Dr. Van Horn explained that his district and several other districts in the SE part of the state work together to provide professional development for their EIs. Their programs are reviewed by Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services, part of FSSA, for appropriate content and length in order to qualify for continuing education units for EIs. He commented that the current process seems to work well and he doesn't believe it needs to be changed. Grandfathering of current EIs is critical in order to keep his students from being hurt. He also expressed concern that changing to EI licenses would change the non-certified status of EIs and result in districts not being able to afford to pay higher salaries to employ the EIs they need. Also, he cautioned there is a fiscal impact to be considered because of the cost of the tests that might be required. The districts are not in a position to pay for the testing. He does not want to have the EI certification process mirror the teacher licensing process. Dr. Johnstone agreed, noting that EIs are not teachers so their certification does not need to mimic the process for teachers. Dr. Johnstone asked how continuing education programs for EIs would be approved. A short explanation of the previous continuing education program approval process was given. Brief discussion ensued as to whether continuing education units could be documented on Professional Growth Plan forms and verified by principals or special education directors.

Ms. Koehler asked whether the cost of employing EIs would prevent districts from hiring instructional assistants. Dr. Van Horn explained that in his district the instructional assistants are the EIs for the deaf and hard of hearing students. He noted again that changing the status of EIs would have a financial impact locally. Discussion concluded with consensus that the current 2-year EI certification process works and doesn't need to be fixed. The draft EI standards presented to the board at the September 30 meeting will use a 2-year renewal cycle and the credential will be called a permit.

Mr. Woebkenberg moved to the "action" portion of the agenda, with the first action item concerning cut scores for Praxis exams. Mr. Mapes announced that Dr. Marg Mast has taken a position outside the DOE, but she agreed to return to make the presentation of recommended cut scores to the board. Dr. Mast explained that it was imperative to review cut scores based on the increased emphasis on content mastery. The board's action will move the recommended scores to the public comment phase. An online public comment site has been developed and the public comment period will be the entire month of September. Board members will have the opportunity to review the public comments prior to final adoption of the scores. Following adoption, any new scores must be posted for 6 months prior to becoming effective. Since that falls in the middle of a testing cycle, Dr. Mast recommends that the new scores be effective starting September 2011. Some cut scores will be recommended to stay the same. Mr. Woebkenberg clarified that the action taken by the board will begin the public comment process on recommended scores, with final adoption coming later.

Dr. Mast first presented the following recommendations concerning the cut scores for existing tests:

MS English/language arts—increase from 152 to 163

MS math—keep score at 156

MS social studies—increase from 153 to 156

MS science—increase from 137 to 148

Social Studies-- increase from 147 to 156

Physical education—increase from 150 to 153

Math—keep score at 136

Biology—increase from 154 to 157

Earth space science—increase from 150 to 155

Chemistry—keep score at 151

Physics—keep score at 149

A motion was made and seconded to move these recommended scores to public comment. The motion passed.

Next, Dr. Mast presented the following recommendations concerning current tests and updated tests:

School Leaders Licensure Assessment—adopt current score of 163

Elementary curriculum and instruction (#0011)—keep current score of 165 for the 2010-11 school year

Reading specialist—keep score at 370

Additionally, Dr. Mast recommended that a review panel be established to see if the ETS test for Physical Science is appropriate. Currently, candidates must pass both the Chemistry and Physics exams to be licensed in Physical Science. Dr. Mast also recommended the board consider the following options, in addition to the Praxis I tests, to demonstrate basic skills proficiency:

Score of at least 22 on the ACT
Composite score of at least 1100 on the SAT
Composite score of at least 1100 on the GRE
A master's degree from a regionally accredited institution
Composite score of at least 527 on the Praxis I

Discussion ensued and the board agreed to move these recommendations on to public comment. A motion was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The next item discussed was the new Elementary Education test (#0014) that focuses more on content than the current test (#0011), which focuses on pedagogy. Dr. Mast recommends it be approved for use after 9/1/11. There are some additional options available to the board. The option identified as "option C" is for additional test items to be added to #0014 in order to be able to have separate math and ELA scores, in addition to the composite score. This option would increase the number of test items from 120 to 180 and add an hour to the test administration time (from 2 to 3 hours). "Option D" would increase the number of items from 180 to 240 and increase test time from 3 to 40 hours, but would also provide individual scores in science and social studies. Increasing the time and number of test items also increases the cost to test takers, but at this time ETS does not know how much. Dr. Mast recommended that during the 2011-12 school year that both elementary education tests be available so whichever test was more appropriate to the candidate could be used. This would allow a transition period into the new test and provide some data for the board to review. Eventually #0014 will replace #0011 when the elementary pedagogy exam is in place.

Dr. Van Horn raised the issue of the timing and wisdom of adopting new tests prior to the teacher standards being complete. He commented that it seems to "put the cart before the horse." Mr. Mapes replied that the board has the option of not moving forward on the new tests and waiting until the standards are completed. A representative from ETS assured the board that the new exams are aligned to the standards of the national organizations for the content areas just as the current exams are, and since the teacher standards currently under development also align to the national organizations' standards there should not be a disconnect in the alignment. The board members representing higher education--Dr. Johnstone, Ms. Riehl, and Dr. Oliver—all expressed a desire to have the option of using #0014 to assess the elementary content knowledge of individuals entering elementary Transition to Teaching programs. Dr. Oliver moved, and Ms. Riehl seconded, a motion to move the #0014 Elementary Education test, including all options presented, to public comment. The motion passed unanimously.

Next Dr. Mast recommended that a test for teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages be moved forward to public comment with a proposed score of 570. A motion was made and seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Mast explained that a panel reviewed the scores for current tests that have been regenerated (updated) and made the following recommendations for new cut scores:

Business Education—new score of 161
French—new score of 156
German—new score of 163
Spanish—new score of 168

Teaching Reading—new score of 159

Early childhood—new score of 156

A motion was made and seconded to move these proposed scores on to public comment. The motion passed unanimously.

The final testing item involves recommendations for new scores for current tests or for tests that have been used previously and are being recommended for use again due to changes in licensing under REPA (individual social studies areas). Dr. Mast presented the following proposed scores:

Art—increase from 149 to 159

Exceptional needs—increase from 150 to 160

Exceptional needs: mild to moderate disabilities—increase from 156 to 171

English language, literature and composition—increase from 153 to 160

Family and consumer sciences—increase from 540 to 157 (score is on a new scale)

Health—increase from 420 to 650

Library media specialist—increase from 530 to 650

Music—increase from 140 to 157

Pre-kindergarten education—increase from 520 to 640

Technology education—increase from 590 to 610

Social studies (#0081)—increase from 147 to 156

Additionally, scores for individual social studies concentration areas (used for licensing under Rules 46-47) are being reactivated for use in 2011-12 to accommodate changes in the way social studies is licensed under REPA. Those scores will be reviewed during 2011-12 and changes will be proposed as necessary. These scores will also be posted for public comment. A motion was made and seconded to move these proposed scores to public comment. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Woebkenberg introduced the next agenda item, which is the accreditation of the teacher education programs for Bethel College and IU-Kokomo. Dr. Mast presented information highlighting the findings of the NCATE board of examiners for Bethel College. The recommendation is to continue the accreditation at the initial program level and defer accreditation at the advanced program level. Dr. Mast explained that Bethel has adequate processes in place at the advanced level but they are not yet formally documented. Bethel will submit formal documentation to NCATE in the future, at which time the advanced level accreditation will be addressed. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Mast presented the NCATE board of examiners recommendation that IU-Kokomo's accreditation be continued at both the initial and advanced preparation levels. The board of examiners noted several Areas for Improvement (AFIs) that IU-K must address and questions were asked specifically about the AFI concerning faculty qualifications. Dr. Amidor from IU-K explained that concern was about adjunct faculty and it was being addressed. The motion was made and seconded to adopt the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Bennett made brief comments thanking the former board members—Dr. Goodwin, Dr. Cate-Clements, Ms. Salyers, Mr. McEwen, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Wilson—for their diligent service, and he welcomed the new

members. He noted that nationally the work of our board is getting attention and he hears interest from other state superintendents in moving their states in the direction Indiana is going.

Mr. Wuebkenberg reminded the board members that future meeting dates are September 30th, November 10th, and December 21st. A motion for adjournment was made and seconded. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.